

# THE RESIDENT STUDENT AT COLUMBIA

HERBERT B. HOWE

Along about 1890, Professor Harry Thurston Peck made some comments on "the college dormitory tradition." Not without relevancy he pictured the humiliation that was then always in reserve for the sensitive Columbian, when in some gathering of students, some youth from the bucolic dingles of Williamstown or Amherst or Cornell, mocked our New Yorker with winged and heart-cutting words: "Huh! Columbia? Hasn't any college life, has it? Men all scatter at 4 P.M., don't they?" Or still more unkindly: "Columbia, Hey? Sort of a day school, ain't it?" Then with some remarks on the Continental universities, the professor reminded his urban colleagues that the dormitory system arose only when the student was regarded as *in statu pupillari*. Instead of calling Columbia a "day school" because she did not coop her sons within her walls at night one might rather give the name of "boarding school" to certain rural collegiate institutions. Back of this sage counsel was the fact that except for two periods of about fifteen years each, within the latter half of the eighteenth century this college had not offered housing facilities to its students. For over a century (from 1800 to 1905) the suggested retort for Columbia students was strictly in order.

The purpose of this article is to trace something of the three periods in which this college has had dormitories—1760 to 1776, 1784 to 1800, and from 1905 to the present. It is worth noting that although the last Commencement was the 178th annual one, yet hardly more than one third of that time have we had residence halls. And also it is of interest

<sup>1</sup> In the history of the university the following halls have served as student residences: i. The original College Building, College Place, 1760-1776, 1784-1800; ii. South Field; Hartley Hall, 1905; Livingston Hall, 1907; Furnald Hall, 1913; John Jay, 1926; iii. East Field; Johnson Hall, 1925. (See "Six Years at Johnson Hall," by Eliza Rhoads Butler, in this QUARTERLY, Sept. 1931, XXIII, 265-275). iv. Barnard College; Brooks Hall, 1907; Hewitt Hall, 1926; v. Teachers' College; Whitteer, 1902; also Bancroft, Seth Low, Harrisons; and Grant Halls. vi. Medical Center: Bard Hall, 1930. (See "Bard Hall" by Charles N. Kent, in this QUARTERLY, June 1931, XXIII, 137-136).

# THE RESIDENT STUDENT AT COLUMBIA

HERBERT B. HOWE

Along about 1890, Professor Harry Thurston Peck made some comments on "the college dormitory tradition." Not without relevancy he pictured the humiliation that was then always in reserve for the sensitive Columbian, when in some gathering of students, some youth from the bucolic dingles of Williamstown or Amherst or Cornell, mocked our New Yorker with winged and heart-cutting words: "Huh! Columbia? Hasn't any college life, has it? Men all scatter at 4 P.M., don't they?" Or still more unkindly: "Columbia, Hey? Sort of a day school, ain't it?" Then with some remarks on the Continental universities, the professor reminded his urban colleagues that the dormitory system arose only when the student was regarded as *in statu pupillari*. Instead of calling Columbia a "day school" because she did not coop her sons within her walls at night one might rather give the name of "boarding school" to certain rural collegiate institutions. Bark of this sage counsel was the fact that except for two periods of about fifteen years each, within the latter half of the eighteenth century this college had not offered housing facilities to its students. For over a century (from 1800 to 1905) the suggested retort for Columbia students was strictly in order.

The purpose of this article is to trace something of the three periods in which this college has had dormitories—1760 to 1776, 1784 to 1800, and from 1905 to the present. It is worth noting that although the last Commencement was the 178th annual one, yet hardly more than one-third of that time have we had residence halls. And also it is of interest

<sup>1</sup> In the history of the university the following halls have served as student residences: i. The original College Building, College Place, 1760-1776, 1784-1800; ii. South Field; Bartley Hall, 1905; Livingston Hall, 1905; Fernald Hall, 1913; John Jay, 1926; iii. East Field; Johnson Hall, 1925. (See "Six Years at Johnson Hall," by Eliza Rhces Butler, in this *QUARTERLY*, Sept. 1931; XXIII, 265-275). iv. Barnard College; Brooks Hall, 1905; Hewitt Hall, 1926; v. Teachers' College; Whittier, 1902; also Bancroft, Seth Low, Garrison, and Grant Halls. vi. Medical Center: Burr Hall, 1930. (See "Burr Hall," by Charles de Kretz, in this *QUARTERLY*, June 1931; XXIII, 132-136).

that these periods coincide with the administrations of the second, third, and twelfth presidents, Doctors Cooper, W. S. Johnson, and Butler. About the time of the purchase of twenty acres on Morningside Heights, preparatory to bringing the college to its third location, the *New York Sun* in an editorial, 29 February, 1892, characterized Columbia in such realistic fashion that it has a certain value even to the present day:

As a distinctly city college Columbia has a mission of its own, and certain decided advantages. It is true that it may never attract to it undergraduate students in as great numbers as Harvard and Yale already secure, but it has now enough of them to justify amply its existence as a college, and if it maintains and increases its deserved reputation as a school of learning, the great population at this most populous center of the Union will always keep the supply sufficient. Even if the majority of parents in this region continue to prefer to send their sons to far-away college communities, there will still remain a minority who will prefer that they should be under home influences and New York associations while they are pursuing their college course. If Columbia undertook to enter into direct competition with Harvard and Yale by establishing a similar college community, it would venture into a field in which it would be a novice measured against veterans and experts.

# I

## THE FIRST EXPERIMENT, 1760-1776

Established in 1754, it was 1760 before the students began to "lodge and diet in the College" which had been built on land given by Trinity Church on Murray and Barclay Streets, west of Broadway (north and west of the site of the Woolworth Building). The *General American Register . . . for . . . 1773*<sup>1</sup> gives as complete a description of King's College in the City of New York as we possess:

The building (which is only one third of the intended structure) consists of an elegant stone edifice, three complete stories high, with four staircases, twelve apartments in each, a chapel, hall, library, museum, anatomical theatre and a school for experimental philosophy.

All students, but those in medicine, are obliged to lodge and diet in the College, unless they are particularly exempted by the governors or president; and for the security of their morals, etc., the edifice is surrounded by an high fence, which also encloses a large court and garden; and a porter constantly attends at the front gate, which is locked at 10.

<sup>1</sup> [Robert] Aitken's *General American Register . . . for . . . 1773* (Philadelphia, 1773), 52.

o'clock each evening in summer, and at 9 in winter; after which hours, the names of all that come in, are delivered weekly to the President.

President Nathaniel Moore in his *History* also ascribes to Myles Cooper this additional description and then adds on his own authority the interesting statement about the planting of the trees:

The College is situated on a dry, gravelly soil, about one hundred and fifty yards from the bank of the Hudson river, which it overlooks; commanding from the eminence on which it stands, a most extensive and beautiful prospect of the opposite shore and country of New Jersey, the City and Island of New-York, Long Island, Staten Island, New-York Bay with its Islands, the Narrows, forming the mouth of the harbor, etc., etc.; and being totally unencumbered by any adjacent buildings, and admitting the purest circulation of air from the river, and every other quarter, has the benefit of as agreeable and healthy a situation as can possibly be conceived.

\* \* \*

On the 23d of October, in this year, 1765, a committee charged with the erection of a fence along the south side of the college ground, was further empowered to build a porter's lodge, to level the college yard, and to plant trees along the fence. From this we may probably infer the age of the noble lindens and sycamores which adorn the college green.<sup>1</sup>

In the correspondence of President Cooper<sup>2</sup> we learn that four pounds a year (one dollar passing for eight shillings—New York currency) was the rental of an apartment with board for eleven shillings a week—extras including firewood, candles, and washing. On this basis with five pounds a year for tuition could a student in New York City before the Revolution prepare his budget. At least, says the worthy Doctor, these are almost the only truly collegiate expenses. In writing to his mother, Madame Washington, John Parke Custis<sup>3</sup> thus described the apartment and his manner of living:

It is now time to give you a short plan of my apartments, & of my way of living. I have a large parlour with two Studys or closets, each large enough, to contain a bed, trunk, & couple of chairs, one I sleep in, & the other Joe calls his, my chamber & parlour are paper'd, with a cheap tho

<sup>1</sup> Nathaniel Fish Moore, *An Historical Sketch of Columbia College in the City of New-York* (New York, 1846), 56-57.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 30.

<sup>3</sup> Herbert Barber Howe, "Colonel George Washington and King's College," *Columbia University Quarterly*, June 1932, XXIV, 152.

very pretty Paper, the other is painted; my furniture consists of six chairs 2 Tables, with a few paultry Pictures; I have an excellent Bed, & in short every thing very convenient & clever. I generally get up about Six or a Little after, dress myself & go to chappel, by the time that Prayers are over, Joe has me a little Breakfast, to which I sit down very contentedly, & after eating heartily, I thank God, & go to my Study, with which I am employ'd till twelve then I take a walk & return about one dine with the Professors, & after dinner study till Six at which time the Bell always [rings] for Prayers they being over College is break up, & then we take what Amusement we please.

Some years before this the president had reported "our numbers yearly increase and our present Apartments overflow." But there is still another source of information about the beginnings of dormitory life and this is none other than the famous (or infamous) *Black Book*.<sup>1</sup> Anticipating the new building the sixth section of the Laws and Orders of the College of New York adopted in 1755, reads:

7<sup>th</sup>. None of the Pupils shall be absent from their Chambers or neglect their Studies without leave Obtained of the President or their respective Tutors, except for Morning and Evening Prayers and Recitation and half an hour for Breakfast and an hour and half after Dinner; and from Evening Prayer till Nine of the Clock at Night. The Penalty, four pence or Some Exercise for Each Offence.<sup>2</sup>

But the real meaning of these words was in the penalties meted out to the residents. Three students were confined to college (within a high fence!) for taking tea-cups out of another student's room and denying they knew anything of them. To go in and out (sometimes over) the college fence at unseemly hours was not approved by the authorities—one student was suspended by the president for going over the top at the awful hour of "½ past 11 o'Clock last Night." One day after hearing the seniors examined for their degrees the Governors of the College coming out of the chapel were met by an irate cook. He explained in some detail how he had been ill treated and the student concerned was reprimanded and ordered not to go beyond the college fence for two weeks. The theft of paper and a penknife brought the culprit literally to his knees before all the students. The porter

<sup>1</sup> Milton Halsey Thomas, ed., *The Black Book, or Book of Misdemeanors in King's College, New York, 1771-1775* (New York, 1931).

<sup>2</sup> Ms. Minutes of the Governors of King's College, 3 June, 1755.

stripped him of his gown and still kneeling he read an acknowledgment of the crime and expressed sorrow for it. But even that was not enough, "he was then forbidden to wear his Gown or Cap for one Week." However long ago this dormitory on Murray Street fronting the North River may have flourished, I doubt if anyone reading this list of cases can fail to see the place in all its reality and humanity! Some students dared to "play at cards" in their rooms; another refused to open his door when repeatedly called upon by the president, two were hailed before the governors for entertaining company and making an unseasonable noise at an unreasonable hour; four intrepid souls on 21 June, 1774, stole a very large quantity of wine out of the president's garret. For going into the country without leave, confinement within the college walls for one fortnight after vacation was prescribed, and for defaulting in exercises, they had "to translate, during the vacation, No 264 of y<sup>e</sup> Spectator, into Latin."

But the collegiate atmosphere of these apartments was rudely stopped by war. Not only did the president have to leave the college and the country in rather hurried fashion but the Committee of Safety<sup>1</sup> delivered preëmtorily a demand for the building (just prior to the Battle of Long Island) in order to establish a military hospital. The British, upon occupying the city, commandeered the college as a barracks. What was left of the student body had dispersed and the books and apparatus were stored in the City Hall and in St. Paul's Chapel. The great fire of 1776 spared the "upper" part of the town but although the college was not destroyed it was in a dilapidated condition after almost ten years of war uses—and most of the hastily stored equipment was never found.

## II

### THE POST WAR PERIOD 1784-1800

With decidedly chilling brevity (and probably with some anti-Tory venom saved from war days) a contemporary re-

<sup>1</sup> N. E. Moore, *op. cit.*, 61-63.

port for 1790<sup>1</sup> describes the college under its new name, Columbia:

The college edifice has received no additions since the peace. The funds produce, annually, about £1000. The library and museum were destroyed during the war. The philosophical apparatus cost about 300 guineas. Until the revolution the college did not flourish. The plan upon which it was originally founded, was contracted, and its situation unfavorable. The former objection is removed, but the latter must remain. It has between thirty and forty students, in four classes. The number for several years has been increasing . . .

But in this second period, beginning in 1784 under the Regents and continuing in 1787 under the new board of Columbia College Trustees, our primary authority is De Witt Clinton. His 1827 address<sup>2</sup> to the alumni contains some valuable information:

On the 17th of May of that year [1784], the first student was admitted into Columbia College, under the new order of things. The Regents of the University attended the examination in person, so important at that period did the Fathers of the Republic consider it, to countenance the incipient efforts in favor of intellectual improvement. I may say, I trust without the imputation of egotism, that I was the first student and among the first graduates of this our Alma Mater on its revival; and I shall never forget the reverent impression made on my youthful mind, by the condescension and devotion to education of the great men who, at that time, presided over the interests of the University. In the course of a few months our numbers were increased. Instructors were appointed, and apartments in the old City Hall were provided for the temporary accommodation of the College, until it was rendered fit for our reception. No President was appointed for some years afterwards . . .

Possibly the college building was used for dormitory purposes during the entire administration of William Samuel Johnson, from 1787 to 1800, but this is only a conjecture. With the reopening came the adoption of a drastic set of house rules which were confirmed by the Statutes of 1785. Judging by the severity of Chapter VIII<sup>3</sup> one is tempted to inquire if there was not more attention to the protection of

<sup>1</sup> "Description of Columbia College, in the City of New York," *New York Magazine* May 1790, I, 256.

<sup>2</sup> William W. Campbell, *The Life and Writings of De Witt Clinton* (New York, 1849), 6-7.

<sup>3</sup> *The Statutes of Columbia College in New York* (New York, 1785), 16-17.

the needy building than to anything or anybody else. The regulations were as follows:

i. If any student shall willfully do an injury to the building of the College, or to any property belonging to it, or to any property belonging to any member of the College, he shall be fined, admonished, or expelled, according to the nature of the offence; and moreover, shall be charged, in his quarter's account, with all expences incurred by the College in repairing such injury.

ii. And if any damage shall be done to any apartment by persons unknown, the expences of repairing the same shall be charged equally to those who occupy it; and if it be not occupied, the expence shall be charged equally to those Students who live upon the same floor, in that number of the building; unless they shall discover the person who committed the same, in which case it shall be charged to him only.

iii. The President and Professors shall, at all times, have the power to enter the chambers of the Students; and if they are refused admittance, shall, open the same by force. And any Student who shall so refuse admittance to the President, or any of the Professors, for the first time shall be fined five shillings and privately admonished; for the second, shall be publicly admonished; and for the third, may be expelled.

iv. It shall be the duty of the President, at least once every week, to visit all the chambers of the Students, and to see that they are kept clean and in decent condition. And if any apartment, or the furniture thereof be found dirty or neglected, the persons owning the same shall be fined one shilling each. If the apartment occupied by any Professor shall be injured by his means or neglect, during the time he has held the same, he shall repair them at his own expence.

Clement Clarke Moore, of "The Night before Christmas" fame, gives us, in his *Alumni Address*,<sup>1</sup> some figures for 1787:

At the time Dr. Johnson entered upon his office, which was in November . . . The number of the students was thirty-nine; of whom, five lodged and boarded in the College, and five occupied rooms and studied there. The yearly income was above 1300 pounds. The institution was evidently in an improved condition, and its future prospects not unfavourable.

But it is a student from Virginia\* who enables us to see dormitory life at its best (or worst):

. . . in June, 1788, I was sent to Columbia College, New-York; just then

<sup>1</sup> Clement Clarke Moore, *Address Delivered before the Alumni of Columbia College, on the 21st of May, 1825, in the Chapel of the College* (New York, 1825), 17.

\* Hugh A. Garland, *The Life of John Randolph of Roanoke* (New York, 1850), I, 24.



having completed my fifteenth year . . . Columbia College . . . was just rising out of chaos . . . Unhappily, my poor brother Theodorick, who was two years older than myself, had a strong aversion to books and a decided taste for pleasure. Often when I had retreated from him and his convivial associates to my little study, has he forced the lock, taken away my book, and rendered further prosecution of my purpose impossible. From that time forward I began to neglect study . . . read only the trash of the circulating library.

John Randolph, as a Columbia student, was an eye-witness of the first inauguration of George Washington as President of the United States, in Wall Street, New York, 30 April, 1789.

A traveler of 1793<sup>1</sup> records all too briefly the living conditions of the students:

25 June, 1793

Some little distance from it [New York Hospital] is the College; where about eighty students are present. They have their studies in the College but are boarded out in the city.

We are indebted to President Stiles<sup>2</sup> of Yale for information as to the reopening of the college. His diary makes very plain the difficulties that had to be faced and the very limited resources available:

21 June, 1784

By a letter from N. York I find they are reviving the College there. They have, it is sd. formed a Junior Class of about 17, a Soph. of 10 & a Fresh. of 5 or 6—or about 30 in the whole. The Governors were to convene last Friday about electing a President

24 June, 1784

The Assembly in N. York have reconstituted the College in the City, much accord<sup>3</sup> to its old Constitution, by the name of Columbia.

29 September, 1784

Rode into N. York; hav<sup>4</sup> dined at F<sup>5</sup> Washington

21 September, 1784

Visited the College—which has only a Junior Class consisting of nine Undergraduates

<sup>1</sup> John Drayton, *Letters Written during a Tour through the Northern and Eastern States of America* (Charleston, S. C., 1794), 25.

<sup>2</sup> Franklin Bowditch Dexter, ed., *The Literary Diary of Ezra Stiles* (New York, 1901).

19 October, 1787

The Hon<sup>6</sup>. Wm. Sam. Johnson LL.D. accepted the Presid<sup>7</sup> of Columbia College a few weeks since.

21 September, 1789

Arrived at N. York & put up at the City Tavern at 4 P.M. accompanied with Judge Sherman paid my Respects to Gen. Washington Presid<sup>8</sup> of the United States. Took lodgings at Capt. Hardings.

22 September, 1789

Visited Columbia College saw & conversed with three Professors; Presid<sup>9</sup> Johnson absent at Congress;<sup>10</sup> & examined the Apparatus for Exp<sup>11</sup> Philosophy, went to Congress P.M. sitt<sup>12</sup> at Federal Hall & heard the Debates.

9 March, 1792

On 22 Feb 1792. The Trustees of Columb. Coll. presented a Petition to the Regency of the Univ<sup>13</sup>, accompanying the above Report of the Regents stating—"That the No of students in Columbia Coll<sup>14</sup> is greatly increased amounting, inclusive of fifty six students,—the Salaries of the President, Professors and other Officers amot to the annual Sum of \$1138.5.10 and that the Income at its full Extent doth not exceed \$1245.15.10. So that for repairs &—Contingencies, there remains—only £107.10.0" praying for Grants for foundg Professorships, for Library & Apparatus &c.

It is to be regretted that we have not more direct evidence from our own records or from the memoirs of our alumni of the use of the building during the closing years of the century. The city directories<sup>15</sup> contain the names of the faculty, the trustees and the rules for admission in 1793,<sup>16</sup> '94 and '95, the rules are omitted for 1796,<sup>17</sup> '97 and '98. In 1799 only the trustees' names are given and from 1800 to 1803 inclusive there is no mention of the college at all. Beginning in 1804 the faculty and trustees are again mentioned. Professor Samuel Latham Mitchill's popular explanation of courses<sup>18</sup> (both the Faculty of Arts and the Faculty of Physics) in 1794 makes no mention at all of living conditions or student interests. In 1797 a French traveller, Brissot de Warville, published a volume on America with a chapter devoted to

<sup>6</sup> Dr. Johnson was elected first Senator from Connecticut, serving from 4 March, 1789 until his resignation, 4 March, 1791.

<sup>7</sup> *New York Directory and Register*, published by William Duncan, 1793-1795, David Lowmorth, 1796-1805; another edition by Langdon and Son, 1804.

<sup>8</sup> *The Present State of Learning in the College of New York* (New York, 1794).

<sup>9</sup> J. P. Brissot de Warville, *New Travels in the United States of America. Performed in 1788* (Boston, 1797).

New York City but without any mention of the college. Stranger by far than this was the omission by John Davis, an Englishman, of Columbia College, although he lived in the city for long periods of his four and one half years in America and mentions his personal relations with Bishop Benjamin Moore, then president of the college.

President Nathaniel Moore in his history of the college has a significant paragraph:

On the 11th of November, 1802, a committee had been appointed to inquire and report on the subject of finishing the new wing to the college building, "taking into view the propriety of removing the college to some more convenient situation." The Trustees, it is evident, were then wavering in doubt as to the expediency of expending on the present site of the college, moneys, which would, in case of its removal, have been thrown away. The same uncertainty continuing to prevail, a committee, appointed in July 1813, was afterwards directed to inquire whether an eligible site for a college could be found, "at a distance from the city not greater than Art-Street;" and, in May 1816, another was appointed, to negotiate for the purchase of "a piece of ground containing thirty-two lots, belonging to the estate of Anthony Bleeker, deceased, not far from Col. Varick's place."

This uncertainty as to the continuance of the college in its original location, appears to have exercised, for a period of about fourteen years, a sort of paralyzing influence on the action of the Trustees. They manifested a constant and very zealous care of the internal condition of the college, and that appears to have been gradually improved; but, though their attention was from time to time called to the ruinous and deplorable state of its exterior, yet that every year grew worse. . . .<sup>1</sup>

The belief is held that the building was used for student residence until the beginning of this "period of fourteen years," that is, until 1807 or 1802. President Johnson had retired in 1800. The Statutes of 1811<sup>2</sup> (there is no record of any issues between 1788 and 1811) contain no mention of the strenuous inspection of dormitory rooms found in the previous edition. The section on Crimes and Punishment is relatively mild:

1. If any student shall neglect his studies; or shall interrupt the studies of any other; or shall disturb the President, Provost, or any of the Professors; or shall in any manner behave indecently, he shall be admon-

<sup>1</sup> John Davis, *Travels of Four Years and a Half in the United States of America* (London, 1803).

<sup>2</sup> N. P. Moore, op. cit., 203-204.

<sup>3</sup> Statutes of Columbia College, as Adopted by the Board of Trustees, June 13, 1801 (New York, 1811), 14-15.

ished, degraded, suspended, or expelled, according to the nature and aggravations of his offence.

2. If any student shall commence any professional study during the years of his academical course, he shall be dismissed from the College.

3. If any student shall attend any place of public amusement during the months of study; or shall be guilty of profane cursing or swearing; or be intoxicated with liquor; or be concerned in any riot; or shall strike a fellow student; or keep the company of infamous persons; or break through or pass over the College walls; or procure a private key for any room in the College; or frequent billiard rooms; or be guilty of gambling; or of any other known vice, he shall be admonished, suspended, or expelled, according to the nature and aggravations of his offence.

4. If any student shall contumaciously resist the authority of the President, Provost, and Professors, or any of them, he shall be expelled.

5. No student who shall have been expelled, or twice dismissed, shall be re-admitted.

But in the very year of these rules Dr. Moore tells us of the dilapidation of the building:

... In May 1811 . . . the Rev. Wm. Harris and the Rev. John M. Mason, were elected president and provost.

At the time these internal improvements were going on, the exterior of the College was in a very deplorable situation. While the institution was gaining new mental vigor and life, its bodily state betrayed symptoms of great weakness and decay.

... in a report made by them [the new president and provost] to the Trustees a few months after their election says: "The interference of the Trustees is requested on behalf of the College buildings and grounds. The roof of the old wing where the professors reside, is so decayed and insufficient that the apartments are deluged by every rain. The new building has been most unfaithfully put up. . . . The wall built by the corporation of the city is too low for the grounds. The grounds themselves are in an offensive state, in consequence of the deprecations of the earthen. And the fence made of light and green wood is already warping, and is almost good for nothing."

The first issue of the *Traveller's Guide* to New York in 1807, after reviewing the history and mentioning Professor Mitchill's report of thirteen years previous, adds, "Since that time there has been no further report made public. . . . Since the revolution, this seminary has been so far altered, as was necessary to adapt it to the new state of affairs. It is

<sup>1</sup> C. C. Moore, op. cit., 21.

<sup>2</sup> The Picture of New-York, or, The Traveller's Guide through the Commercial Metropolis of the United States (New York, 1807), 141-143.

now called 'Columbia College.' Its income is about £1500, but it is expected to increase, with the renewal of some of the existing leases of land." But again for a definite statement we are obliged to turn to another president of Yale College: Timothy Dwight in his travels had visited New York City and looked over the College and in 1814 or '15 he wrote:

At the head of the Literary institutions in New York is Columbia College. The building, in which it is established, stands on a tract, given to it originally by the Rector of the Episcopal congregation in this city, and the inhabitants in communion with the church of England; or what is now called the Corporation of Trinity Church: the richest Ecclesiastical body, it is believed, in the United States. The ground, on which the College is built, is bounded upon Church, Barclay, and Murray streets. The building itself presents to the eye nothing, which is either beautiful or magnificent. . . .

The Academical Faculty, or, as it is here styled, the Faculty of the Arts, consists of a President, a Provost, and four Professors: one of Moral Philosophy, one of Classical Literature, one of Mathematics and Natural Philosophy, and one of Logic, Rhetoric, and Belles-Lettres.

Of the number of students in this Seminary I am ignorant. A tolerable estimate may however be formed by recurring to the Catalogue of Graduates. The four classes, who received the degree of A.B. in 1811, 1812, 1813, 1814, amounted to 74. All the students live at their respective lodgings in the city.

The whole number of those, who have taken the degree of A.B. in this College to the year 1776 inclusive was 110. For ten years the course of education was interrupted by the Revolutionary War, and its consequences. From the year 1786, when its operations commenced again under the name of Columbia College, to the year 1814 inclusive, the whole number was 502. Total 612.

There are no tutors in this Seminary.

Columbia College is well endowed. . . .

The general attachment to learning is less vigorous in this city than in Boston: commerce having originally taken a more entire possession of the minds of its inhabitants. The character of New-York, however, has, for some time been materially changing in this respect; and is still changing. A great number of the citizens give their sons a liberal education and the interests of Columbia College have become more an object of the public regard.<sup>1</sup>

President Dwight's clear cut statement as to the students living at their homes is developed further by Hardie<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Timothy Dwight, *Travels in New England and New-York* (New Haven, 1821-22), III, 467-468, 473.

<sup>2</sup> James Hardie, *The Description of the City of New-York* (New York, 1809), 221.

twelve years later, although he also has a word as to student societies and a very appreciative mention of the College Green. But it must not be forgotten that the latter description followed the renovation which President Moore had reported as urgent.

The college was repaired in the year 1818-19 with great taste and elegance, and besides dwelling houses for the accommodation of the President and Professors, contains the necessary lecture rooms, the chapel, the library, apartments for the philosophical and chemical apparatus and rooms for the meetings of some literary societies formed by the students for their mutual improvement. The College Green near the centre of which the College stands, is one of the most delightful spots in our city.

A guide book of 1828<sup>3</sup> furnishes additional evidence:

The edifice, and grounds attached to it, are very extensive; the building is three stories high, built of stone, and stuccoed; it is 200 feet in length, and 50 in width, with two projecting wings at each end; it contains accommodations for the professors: there is also a chapel, and lecture rooms, hall, library, museum, and an extensive philosophical and astronomical apparatus. The students do not reside in the building, as is the custom in many other colleges in this country. . . . The number of students belonging to the College is 150. The expense of tuition, yearly, is ninety dollars.

### III

#### THE LONG INTERREGNUM 1800-1904

These two periods of dormitory life had been so short as to play little part in the working tradition of the college. We are not at all surprised to have a graduate of 1842<sup>4</sup> speak of the halls on Morningside Heights as the only residence halls the college ever possessed:

The entire absence of any kind of dormitory life in the history of the College until comparatively recent days must of necessity have greatly diminished that close friendship which results from the present system, where four years of living together unite the students in a close bond enduring for all of their later lives. The ties of that older College life are very slight indeed and the graduate students of old seem to know very little of their classmates after the Valedictory has been said and to care less.

<sup>3</sup> *The Picture of New-York, and Stranger's Guide to the Commercial Metropolis of the United States* (New York, 1828), 231-232.

<sup>4</sup> George Clinson Parent, "In the Days of Shaddles," *Columbia Alumni News*, 3, March, 1906.

But his last sentence is softened considerably by his appreciation of the old campus on Murray Street. What a fine thing it would have been if this Green with its noble trees planted before the Revolution could have been preserved as a park and as a real reminder of New York City's first college! After all the bronze tablet on the northeast corner of Park Row and West Broadway and the ground rents are meagre compensation.

Far down in the lower part of New York City in the earlier half of the last century there stood in a large plot of ground, directly behind the site of the Woolworth Building, on Broadway, a long row of brick buildings, gray with the lapse of many years, in the midst of a large grassy plot, adorned with trees. This was not a group of buildings, but a long straight front much like the blocks of houses that now line the uptown streets of New York City. It was a graceful outlook, and with its large green and noble trees, gave the look of a veritable seat of learning. It was dignified and restful in its quiet surroundings. The row was a long straight front, extending from east to west and facing to the south. This was the Columbia College of those days. At the east and west ends of this structure were two houses occupied as residences by professors, while in the center was the entrance to the chapel and the various class rooms, together with accommodation for the president. The long building was surmounted at the centre by a cupola in which swung the College bell, which rang out notice of the chapel services at nine o'clock every morning and also marked the closing of each hour of the recitations of the students in their various classrooms.

Mr. John B. Pine in his brief sketch of college history<sup>1</sup> quotes an alumnus' praise of the charm of the first location of Columbia:

A member of the Class of '39 gives the following description of the college as it appeared in his day, when it "occupied a plot of ground bounded by Church Street, Murray Street, and College Place. The building was of brick, covered with stucco, painted light brown, with trimmings of free stone. The front was to the south. At the east and west ends, respectively, were two houses occupied by members of the faculty, which projected considerably beyond the middle buildings; all were three stories high, and there was an old-fashioned belfry in the middle; it was a picturesque old structure, unmistakably academic. In front was a Green of considerable size, bordered by large sycamores. The place had an air of conventual quiet and seclusion, and was delightful in summer, when the shadows of the broad leaves rested on the light brown walls and the

<sup>1</sup> John Buckley Pine, *King's College, now Columbia University* (New York, 1896), 43-44.

flagstones of the walk. The middle of the edifice was devoted to the chapel and library. The latter occupied the second floor, and on the floor below were the lecture rooms. The location was about the centre of the fashionable part of the city."

If we are at all correct in our conjecture that the second experiment in dormitory maintenance closed about 1800 then there were some sixty years when the original building was used only for curricular purposes. The hard scramble of the early days of the reopening had slowly given way before the growing city and resources, and opportunities were available for the growing institution. In 1814 the Botanical Garden (now the site of Rockefeller Center) had been given to the college and in the same year the building and campus were improved. President Nathaniel Moore towards the end of his administration (1846) gave a clear picture of the growing college in the growing city:

As regards the present state and prospects of the college, they are such as may encourage its friends. The Trustees have lately entered upon measures, which, with some sacrifice of that ornament hitherto derived to the college edifice and its vicinity, from the free space and open grounds behind it, promise to relieve the institution, after a few years, from the pecuniary embarrassments which have, for a long time, impeded in some degree its useful action.

The great extension of our city towards the North, and the so general removal of its inhabitants in the same direction, have threatened such serious injury to the college, that the question of its own removal was not long ago revived; but the number of students it already receives from Brooklyn, Jamaica, and Staten Island, the rapidly growing population, more especially of Brooklyn; and the increasing facility of communication between the neighboring islands and the college, authorize the hope that the patronage it will obtain from those quarters will, in a great measure, counteravail the inconvenience of its location, considered merely as regards the city of New-York, and that the number of its students, which has been gradually advancing for the last three years, will hereafter be better proportioned to its just claims, and to the great advantages which its academic course holds out to studious youth.

The college has the greater reason to expect support from the quarters mentioned, because students who come thence will experience in greater degree than those residing in New-York, the benefits of a system which, leaving students to the comfort, the security, and the salutary influences of their home, unites parental discipline and supervision with that which the college exercises.

<sup>2</sup> N. F. Moore, *op. cit.*, 102-104.

And then he states Columbia's position on dormitories which we shall find repeated time and again. These were the days when the College was winning its reputation as a carefully integrated, comparatively small, New York City institution.

A writer on the state of education in New York, about thirty years ago, viewing this matter in a different light, supposed one cause of the small number of students resorting to Columbia College, may be the preference given to institutions which require residence within their walls. There may be truth in this conjecture, since this preference is not unusual, but there is reason to believe that the grounds for it are often such as will not bear examination. A father who finds his son difficult to manage, is easily persuaded to send him abroad for his education; and, willingly to flatter himself that all is going well, so long as he neither sees nor hears anything to the contrary, he quiets his conscience by this endeavor to devolve on others the great responsibility that he ought to bear, or at least to share himself.

The reverend and learned head of a neighboring University, a profound writer and thinker on subjects of morals as well as education, in his "Thoughts on the Present Collegiate System of the United States," argues very forcibly against the plan of residence within the college, even for the students sent to it from abroad.

The plan which he prefers may perhaps be suited for a country town; but neither residence within the college, nor, at the student's choice, without it, would be safe for those sent from a distance to the city of New York. Yet the temptations and dangers even of this great city, are less to youths who live under the anxious watch of a parent's eye at home, than are those of the smallest village to young men abandoned to themselves and unrestrained, as experience shows they are, and as they must inevitably be, when sent to any college whatever in this country to reside.

We think it therefore an inestimable advantage attending the system here adopted, that youth may obtain a collegiate education without a separation from their natural friends, or any check to the expansion of those virtues and affections which are the peculiar growth of the domestic circle—of the family—which, with all its sympathies of relationship and society, is the natural situation for the young.

By the time that Charles King came to the Presidency in 1849 the downtown location was crowding with business interests and the college location was such as to lose caste for the institution. The number of students was falling off yearly. The city's trend was out beyond the older municipal

<sup>1</sup> A delightful account of President King, by his daughter, Gertrude King Schnoyter, appeared in *Gentleman's Magazine*, May 1924, LV, 671-679, with the title "A Gentleman of the Old School."

boundaries. Central Park's site had been purchased by the city in the middle fifties, from 1853 to the fire of 1858 the Crystal Palace flourished on 42nd Street, the corner stone of St. Patrick's Cathedral at Fifth Avenue and 50th Street (of which James Renwick of the Class of 1836 was architect) was laid in 1858 and about the same time Amos R. Eno with daring foresight built the Fifth Avenue Hotel at the corner of 23rd Street—the most northerly of the city's hosteleries. Columbia College became part of this expansive movement and purchased property at Madison Avenue and 49th Street—intending eventually to build on the Botanical Garden site across the Avenue from the Cathedral. Mr. Pine<sup>1</sup> tells of the opening of the "New College":

While these educational developments were under consideration, plans for the removal of the college were also occupying the attention of the trustees. The fact that its original site had become unsuitable had long been recognized, though for many years the college green preserved its verdure and tranquility in the midst of encroaching commerce. By degrees it was intersected with streets: "Chapel Street" and "College Place" for a time marked the site, but even these have now lost their identity in West Broadway. In 1854 the trustees determined upon removal, but the exercises were continued until May 7, 1857, when the last service was held in the old chapel, the ancient corner stone was disinterred from its long resting-place to be borne to its new home, and the halls which had echoed to the march of history were abandoned forever.

A portion of the Botanical Garden, between Fifth and Sixth Avenues, Forty-ninth and Fiftieth Streets, was selected as the site to which the college should be removed from Murray Street, and Mr. Upjohn was employed to prepare a design for the new buildings. The execution of this project, however, was found to be impracticable, for the time being, on account of the expense involved; and in November, 1856, the trustees purchased of the Institution for the Instruction of the Deaf and Dumb twenty lots situated on Madison Avenue, between Forty-ninth and Fiftieth Streets. The purchase was made upon favorable terms, and the action of the trustees was influenced largely by the fact that the buildings of the institution were available for the immediate use of the college, with but slight alterations. The opening services were held in the chapel of the "New College," as it was called, May 12, 1857. The buildings consisted of a large edifice of brick and brown stone, standing on the high ground near Fiftieth Street, with adjacent buildings at either end, one of which served as a chapel, and the other as a residence for professors. President King and his family at first occupied rooms in the main building, which also furnished a number of class and lecture rooms. The prin-

<sup>1</sup> J. B. Pine, *op. cit.*, 47-48.

capal architectural feature of the central building was a lofty portico; and the group of buildings, shaded by a row of fine old trees, on a beautiful lawn sloping southward, presented a pleasing and dignified appearance. "The present location of the College" is described in a contemporary newspaper as "a delightful one, and undesirable only on account of the distance up town. . . . The site is on a commanding eminence, affording an extensive and pleasant view."

Columbia prospered in this up-town location and in 1870 had enrolled 776 students—way in advance of registration at the older place. In that same year President Barnard<sup>1</sup> reports to the trustees:

Almost without exception the students of Columbia College reside in their own homes and are subject to the constant observations of their parents.

Within seven years two problems were facing the authorities—the registration was then almost 1400—"in the case of students whose residences are beyond the rivers" exemption<sup>2</sup> from the obligation to attend morning chapel regularly had to be granted and the president is urging on the trustees the great need of apartments<sup>3</sup> in which students could profitably employ themselves when not under instruction. The inadequacy of the 49th Street location was becoming more and more a subject of discussion. It was in a true sense a repetition of the agitation of the thirties and forties but accelerated by the increasing change and expansion of the city. The presidential report for 1878<sup>4</sup> (and Dr. Barnard's reports are statesmanlike analyses and summaries of the college problem in America) says:

If the college were on a footing of equality in the competition for undergraduate attendance with its contemporaries, that is to say, if it were situated in the suburbs of the city, with large grounds, comfortable lodgings for students and a resident academic community, there is reason to believe that it would soon in point of numbers rival the most flourishing of them all. Inasmuch, however, as its attendance is almost wholly drawn from the city and its immediate environs, its growth is restrained by artificial conditions which it cannot control.

<sup>1</sup> *Annual Report of the President, 1870, 16.*

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid., 1877, 23.*

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid., 1876 (unpublished).*

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid., 1878, 28-29.*

Some years earlier the *Evening Post*<sup>1</sup> in commenting on Columbia had doubted the wisdom of even attempting to overcome these conditions:

Without large grounds and dormitories, and the assumption of a constant supervisory care over her undergraduate students she cannot, and no city college can, attract to herself the youth of the interior. But such provisions would require an unproductive investment more than sufficient to sink all the wealth of even this financially-powerful corporation. Columbia College depends, therefore, upon New York City and its environs, for the number of her undergraduates.

Although this second location of the college at 49th Street was but "temporary" it really lasted forty years, 1857-1897. It was the scene of Columbia's rapid growth. In the middle of the period the enrollment was in excess of that of Michigan, Harvard, or Yale.<sup>2</sup> When it is recalled that at the time of the transfer to the up-town site a student body of a hundred and fifty was the order, it is perfectly amazing to find a tenfold greater enrollment within two decades. And yet no facilities for residence were developed; the most the college offered were some rooms for recreation and for student societies in the new Hamilton Hall (1879). Fraternities had rented rooms in the neighborhood whose very locations were the most secret of secret knowledge. It was functioning as a city day college, but with great ambitions. No less than nineteen plans<sup>3</sup> of various kinds were considered by alumni and trustees between 1866 and 1891. Finally in January, 1892 the announcement was made that Columbia College had purchased on Morningside Heights "nearly twenty acres of land, richly wooded in part, and almost perfectly level." This was to be the third, and final, site of the institution and located on the revolutionary battlefield of Harlem Heights. By this time Seth Low had become president and almost at once he voiced the desires of those who sought a resident college—the kind enjoyed for a few years a century and a quarter before. He, at once, wrote to the Committee on the Site (20 January, 1893)

<sup>1</sup> "Columbia College," *New York Evening Post*, 29 July, 1874.

<sup>2</sup> *Annual Report of the President, 1879, 4.*

<sup>3</sup> See the bound collection of Reports on the New Site and Buildings, 1891-1896, in Columbian.

... In regard to dormitories, it is not convenient to determine definitely the policy of the College at the present moment. You may, however, locate buildings enough, in addition to those already spoken of, to accommodate 500 students if used as dormitories, but which will be available for other purposes if the Trustees prefer.

Within four years (16 November, 1896) the trustees decided to plan for residence halls on the Morningside site as the *University Bulletin*<sup>1</sup> at the close of 1896 reports:

The action of the Trustees in formally recognizing the desirability of residences for students on or near the University grounds will doubtless afford much satisfaction to the great body of the Alumni who have persistently urged the establishment of dormitories ever since a removal of the University was projected. The demand for dormitories, which has been so strong and so universal among graduates, is but a concrete expression of a desire to secure for Columbia more of that "college life" which is undoubtedly one of the greatest attractions of other colleges and universities, and which is by many regarded as an essential element of a college education. In many cases this feeling has been inspired by a sense of personal loss on the part of those who have not had this experience, and by the recognition of the fact that the students of other colleges enjoyed advantages which have heretofore been denied at Columbia. Now that the way has been opened to supply this want it is to be hoped that the rumors which have been current for several years of large sums available for dormitories may materialize, and that the authority conferred upon the Treasurer to receive gifts for such purposes may soon be exercised.

This action caused much public comment. Editorially the *Tribune* (23 November, 1896) commended the trustees most wholeheartedly:

... The student life of the old Columbia College was largely conditioned by the absence of dormitories and the fact that the undergraduates were swallowed up in the community about them, each having his own family ties. ...

Columbia stands peculiarly in need of dormitories, almost in proportion to the force of circumstances which in former years would seem to have forbidden them. The students in the ordinary undergraduate courses, who for the most part give college life its tone, have generally been New-Yorkers for whom no residence had to be provided. The college, therefore, developed as a day school, far behind other institutions of the same standing in that sometimes foolish, generally extravagant, but exceedingly useful thing, "college spirit." This lack was intensified beyond what it might have been in a non-dormitory college elsewhere by the peculiar conditions of New-York society. ...

<sup>1</sup> *Columbia University Bulletin* (Dec. 1896, No. 15, 46-47).

Dormitories will bring a great change. Probably the bulk of the students will continue to live in city homes, but those who do dwell on the campus will be the centre of a new college life that will infect all the others. They themselves will benefit by more than enthusiasm and identification with college interests. They will gain comfortable quarters at reasonable rates. No town could offer more dreary accommodation to undergraduates from abroad than the rooms in New-York boarding-houses which most of them can afford to occupy. No wonder they have not sought our schools in large numbers. The attendants at the professional schools are also victims of New-York high-rents and homelessness. ...

The *Evening Post* (21 November, 1896) quoted a large number of prominent Columbia alumni and faculty, Dean Van Amringe among the others:

Prof. J. H. Van Amringe, the dean of the college, spoke of the innovation with considerable enthusiasm, and said to the *Evening Post* reporter: "The adoption by the trustees of the dormitory system is an act that will receive the hearty approval of the alumni. For a great many years the absence of such a system at Columbia has been deplored. Since the acquisition of the new site, there is, perhaps, no single matter connected with the college that has received more general attention and more hearty commendation than the dormitory system. It has been looked to by students and alumni as a means of supplying what the college has always lacked, an opportunity to cultivate what is distinctly known as college life. It will doubtless attract to the college many students from the city of New-York who go now to other colleges to obtain the sort of life here referred to. The site at One Hundred and Sixteenth Street seems very well adapted to such a system, inasmuch as upon the grounds themselves there is a fine opportunity for exercise, and the new boat-house on the Hudson River is convenient. The buildings that are contemplated there involve a gymnasium as well as meeting-rooms for the students. There will be upon that ground every opportunity in the library and in the surroundings to cultivate a true life of sociability, scholarship, and out-door activity. When the alumni generally learn the good news they will have all their interests in the college quickened. ...

But eight years were to elapse before actual construction began. *Spectator* (16 February, 1897) complained at the delay and from the student point of view this criticism was justified.

When under present conditions, as we have pointed out, Columbia offers few attractions for those who live under her very nose, how under the sun can she hope to attract those who live at a distance? Public sentiment must be aroused if the efforts for a dormitory are to meet with real success.

Not only was the character of the student body beginning to change (more extended areas were being drawn on, especially for the professional schools) but also the transportation facilities to 116th Street were not of the best (the subway was not opened until Columbia had been at the new location for seven or eight years). But there was another side to the problem and with that the trustees were wrestling. There was no tradition as to residence halls and, consequently, no specific gifts for dormitories on the new site (the old dormitory experiments were matters of ancient record only—almost archeological) and the cost of the development of this new land was enormous. Furthermore it was three and one-half miles out in the city's suburbs and there was a question whether the great growth experienced on 49th Street would continue. And then, finally, real estate interests were greatly concerned with the purchase of this northern property and were seeking to develop the locality in every possible way. These private interests were offering to build apartments for students and, if they did, possibly the trustees would be all the better able to erect the necessary laboratories and libraries and recitation buildings. Among others, two such privately owned projects stand out prominently—Hamilton Court,<sup>1</sup> (nineteen stories high to house 1000 students) to be erected on Amsterdam Avenue, and Knowlton Hall,<sup>2</sup> an apartment house adapted to student needs on Broadway at 124th Street. The former did not materialize because the promoters sought a heavier guarantee than the trustees though wise and the latter simply did not attract students and was changed to other uses. Much printer's ink was devoted to such projects as these during the first few years on Morningside. A factor of importance in the final decision was a carefully written letter of Mr. John B. Prite to the Finance Committee, 10 February, 1898, wherein the debit and credit sides of the project are stated in detail to support the conclusion:

The more carefully the question is considered, the more apparent it becomes that we can build and operate dormitories more cheaply and more successfully than anyone can do it for us. . . . Dormitories will meet

<sup>1</sup> *New York Journal*, 29 November, 1896.

<sup>2</sup> *Columbia Spectator*, 13 April, 1909.

the popular expectation and demand, so repeatedly and persistently expressed since the new site has been in contemplation; and by introducing into the University the element of student life, will, as I confidently believe, increase its popularity and enlarge the registration more than any other step we can possibly take. . . .

Later that year the Committee on Buildings and Grounds in a formal printed report<sup>3</sup> to the trustees advised against placing dormitories on the Quadrangle (near the Low Library) but suggested four residence-halls on the Green—along 120th Street. These halls were to be five stories in height, the two larger accommodating 130 students each and the two smaller 100 each, they were divided into entries and were not unlike certain present day types of college residences. In the Christmas edition that year *Spectator*<sup>4</sup> included a supplement with sketch and floor plans of these buildings. An editorial in that important issue of the college paper said: ". . . the greatest and most urgent need of Columbia is for dormitories, which will enable students from the city and from all parts of the country to live in the university."

The trustees soon issued an appeal (5 December, 1898) for donations, to alumni and friends of the university in order to build dormitories on the Green. Then the enthusiastic Dean of the College declared: "One deterrent to expansion is thus put in the way of removal 'as soon as means therefore shall be provided by gift or legacy.'" But this decision (like the Resolution of November, 1896) was to be delayed in execution for on 12 January, 1900 a special committee of three was appointed:

to encourage the erection of dormitories in the neighborhood of the University, to draft suitable regulations for their design and regulation, to give special and official recognition to dormitories conducted in harmony with such regulations. . . .

In President Low's Report for 1900 he combined both the plan for college residences (for which no donations had been made) and the hope for privately operated halls:

<sup>3</sup> *Report of the Committee on Buildings and Grounds on Dormitories*, 16 November 1898.

<sup>4</sup> *Columbia Spectator*, 21 December, 1898, a very important issue, with illustrated supplement.



The growth of the academic community in the neighborhood of the University has been so rapid as to lead to the appointment, this year, of a Committee on Dormitories. No buildings especially intended for the use of students have yet been given to the University, nor have any been erected in its neighborhood. The time cannot be far distant, however, when this development will take place in one form or the other, and perhaps in both. In the meanwhile, all sorts of questions have arisen relating to this subject. The Committee on Dormitories has authority to define the attitude of the University, both generally and in detail, as to any branch of this question that may call for prompt action. Similar committees have been appointed by Barnard College and by Teachers College. The President of the University is Chairman of all three committees, so that joint action can be had in case of need. . . .

In his next annual report (1901) the President gave the dormitory question more adequate treatment at the same time reporting that Teachers College, through a private corporation composed of her friends, was erecting a large dormitory for women on Amsterdam Avenue.

The strong desire of the college students for dormitories, as a means of still further strengthening an esprit de corps, seems to me a natural one; and, in view of the large number of students that are already coming to the College from out of the city, not to speak of the still larger number who live within the city at great distances from the College, I hope that this demand will soon be gratified. . . . I do not think it is generally known how greatly the character of Columbia College has changed, in the last three decades, by becoming national in scope rather than entirely local. It may be true that for many young men, whose home is in the city, it is an advantage to go elsewhere to college; but he would be a bold man who would argue, that it is not equally true that it is an advantage for many men, whose home is in the country, to get their liberal education in the inspiring and stimulating atmosphere of a great city. At any rate, such men are coming to Columbia College in large numbers; and the same influences that have led the forerunners to come are likely to persist. Under these circumstances, it seems clear that the University should make some provision for students of this character. . . . The following tabulation shows the number of men students living, even under existing conditions, in the immediate neighborhood of the University—say, on the plateau bounded by 110th and 125th Streets and lying between Morningside Park and the Hudson River.

College 66, Law, 141, Medicine 10, Applied Science 130, Political Science 26, Philosophy 11, Pure Science 13, Total, 397.

There is one other thing to be said for the gift of a dormitory, which, under existing conditions, has for us special importance. Every other building increases the expenses of the University. A dormitory will add to the income of the University not only directly, by the amount which

it produces in excess of the cost of administration; but dormitories undoubtedly, will add, indirectly also, to the income of the University, by increasing the number of students that will be drawn to it.

By the erection upon The Green of the few dormitories which it will conveniently hold; and by the erection, in the neighborhood of the University, of one or two large buildings, large enough to permit each room to be rented cheaply, Columbia can be placed in a position to open its really great advantages to the many graduates throughout the country who would gladly come to it except for the item of expense. For all of these reasons, I am persuaded that dormitories for Columbia are greatly to be desired, and I hope that one or more will be given to the University in the near future.

Before the next presidential report was issued the administration had changed (Seth Low having become the Mayor of Greater New York) and Dr. Butler<sup>1</sup> made a very definite statement as to a dormitory.

I wish we might speedily have dormitories erected for us on the South Field which we hope soon to own, and that they might, when built, enclose a campus for Columbia College about which will centre the memories and the affections of generations of grateful students. It should always be borne in mind that a dormitory is the one type of building used by a university from which an income may be derived. A gift of \$400,000, for example, if used for the building of dormitories, would provide, in perpetuity, an annual income of between \$18,000 and \$20,000 for the University.

Four notices in the 1903 *Spectator* told the result of this final appeal and described the developing campus at 116th Street:

10 June, 1903

At the luncheon of the Columbia University Alumni Association this afternoon President Butler announced . . . a gift of the sum of \$400,000, in large part from Marcellus Hartley Dodge, President of the Class of 1903, for the erection and equipment of a dormitory for the students of Columbia, preference being given to the students of the college.

23 September, 1903

With the reopening of the University to-day, Columbia enters upon her 150th year . . . Those who now return to the University after a summer's rest will find several causes for gratification. South Field is ours; the spectre of the apartment house will haunt it no more. And the first dormitory is no longer a chimerical vision; it is an assured fact.

<sup>1</sup> Annual Report of the President, 1904, 29.

6 October, 1903

In addition to this gift of Mr. Pulitzer's, (the School of Journalism) the following announcement of further gifts was made by the President:

Gift of Mrs. Helen Hartley Jenkins of Morristown, N. J. and Marcellus Hartley Dodge of the Class of 1903, to build and equip a dormitory, primarily for the students of Columbia College.....	\$300,000.
Gift of anonymous donors to build a University Chapel (not to exceed).....	\$300,000.

9 November, 1903

With the recent announcement that over one thousand men would have taken advantage of dormitory facilities had they been available this year, comes a keener realization of what Hartley Hall and its successors will mean for Columbia. A thousand like-minded men, with similar interests, occupations, and ideals may seem a small number in this great city; but they would, undoubtedly, in this instance, come to a keener consciousness of their community of spirit because hemmed in by the materialistic and different interest of the great metropolis. Visitors to Columbia often remark, and most of us have probably realized, that, when once the gate is entered or the library terrace ascended, the city, with its characteristics, seems, except for the disillusioning clang of trolley bell or exhaust of a steam drill, to be miles away. They and we feel the academic atmosphere which pervades the entire place. How much will this effect be heightened when South Field has been transformed, when most of the students are living at the university, when we may count as our student life, not only each day from 9:30 to 5:30, but the entire academic year.

Visions of this ideal student life, thoughts for better support for college activities, and thrifty financial considerations make the speedy erection of Hartley Hall and the provision for other dormitories a "consummation devoutly to be wished."

But of especial value is the original plan of the trustees for the newly purchased block south of the Library Quadrangle. The *Spectator* for 8-March, 1904 outlines the situation and gives us the reason for the type of building decided upon—a decision of great weight in all our residence problems and quite at variance with the former suggestions for small buildings on the Green along 120th Street:

At the meeting of the Board of Trustees held yesterday the question of the development of South Field, which has been under consideration ever since the Trustees decided to make the purchase, was taken up and a comprehensive plan was adopted. In its general features the arrangement of the buildings resembles that of the University campus. The base

line and cornice line are to be of the same elevation, and similar material will be employed. The general character of the architecture of the University buildings will be preserved with such modifications as will render the new buildings appropriate to be used as dormitories. Two great quadrangles have been planned, one occupying the easterly and the other the westerly portion of the Field leaving unoccupied the central portion with a width of 360 feet on each front and extending from street to street (463 feet). No plans have as yet been decided upon for the central portion as it is deemed improbable that it will be required for buildings for some years at least, and the Trustees are desirous of preserving as much open space as possible. The easterly quadrangle adjoining Amsterdam Avenue and the westerly quadrangle adjoining Broadway will each consist of six buildings. The two buildings facing on 116th Street are set apart for academic purposes and of the remainder it is expected that eight will ultimately be used as residences for students. At the present time it is proposed to build two dormitories only, one of which will be Hartley Hall, the dormitory to be erected in memory of the late Marcellus Hartley, for which \$300,000 was given to the University by Mrs. Helen Hartley Jenkins and Marcellus Hartley Dodge of the Class of 1903.

These will stand on the line of Amsterdam Avenue and will be connected by a two-story building also planned for living rooms. Each hall will be 137 feet in length by 61 feet in width at its widest point, and will be nine stories in height, containing 298 rooms of varying size, suitable for use either as studies or bedrooms, separately or in suites. There will be two elevators and three flights of stairs. Lavatories and baths will be provided on each floor and stationary basins in the bedrooms. The entrance will be from the quadrangle into a spacious vestibule opening on a hall about 60 feet by 30 feet in size, which is to be furnished as a club room, and it is expected to be a social meeting place for the residents of the Hall. The buildings will be of fire-proof and steel construction.

It has been found necessary to give the buildings the height indicated for economical reasons, and in order that with moderate rentals they may produce a fair income, but as the ceilings are naturally lower than in any of the present academic buildings, the sky-line will be the same as Scheerhorn and Fayerweather. Owing to the slope of the land from 116th to 114th Streets it has been found necessary to divide the Field into two levels. The northerly and higher level will form a terrace extending back 90 feet from the street nearly even with the sidewalk, while the remainder of the Field will be graded to a level about eight feet lower than the terrace. It is hoped that the laying of the corner stones of the buildings will form a part of the exercises on October 31 next, in commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the foundation of Columbia.

The architects, Messrs. McKim, Mead & White, have nearly completed the working drawings, and it is expected that as the weather permits, and that both buildings, having accommodations for a total of about five hundred students, will be ready for occupancy in September 1905.

## IV

THE PRESENT FACILITIES  
SINCE 1905

Hartley Hall was ready for occupancy with the opening of the academic year of 1905-1906 and with it was Livingston Hall, located to the southward on Amsterdam Avenue. The generous gift of the building in memory of Marcellus Hartley had encouraged the trustees to invest university funds in this other unit of the resident plan (in memory of Robert R. Livingston of the Class of 1765) so that at the start two halls offered accommodations<sup>1</sup> for 600 men. This was a great step in advance and, in Columbia's uptown location, met needs which had been voiced for many years. It is interesting to recall—in connection with the first residence ventures down on Murray Street—that the corner stones of these halls were laid at the 150th anniversary of the university, 31 October, 1904. In the first issue of *Spectator* for the fall of 1905 (27 September) we find a most enthusiastic article describing the halls—with pictures and floor plans—under the heading: "Most Complete Residence Hall of any University in the Country." And then an editorial beginning:

The completion of Hartley and Livingston Halls marks the realization of one of the fondest hopes of Columbia and the beginning of a new epoch in the history of the University; for to-day, for the first time in its long existence, does Columbia offer to its students the advantages of a resident university.

Three and one half years before these halls were completed another member of the same family—Mr. Cleveland H. Dodge—had made possible the opening of Earl Hall on the quadrangle near the Library. This building has just passed (17 March, 1932) its thirtieth birthday<sup>2</sup> and the records of its use have been placed in *Columbiana*. It offered to the students more of a center for activities of all kinds than they had ever possessed and gave a rallying point for what is now included within the Athletic Association, King's Crown, as well as the general social and religious interests. Unfortunately Earl Hall and the dormitories were not more closely

<sup>1</sup> *Columbia Spectator*, 28 September, 4 December, 1904.  
<sup>2</sup> See this *QUARTERLY*, June 1932, XXIV, 256-258.

situated for a certain distinction at once developed in the types of service each was to render in developing student life. In President Butler's *Report* for 1908 he mentioned the need of a building as a central club house for the students living in the residence halls and in the fraternity houses and urged that such a building be under the control of the students themselves. Afterward East Hall, to a limited extent, became the activities building until 1926 when John Jay Hall was opened. But no mention of the early days of the residence halls on South Field would be at all adequate without reference to Earl Hall and its usefulness to all student interests during the first decade of its existence. Exactly the same kind of problem faced the dormitories as to an eating place.<sup>3</sup> The Commons in University Hall was the nearest available. *Spectator* for 6 April, 1905, announced that the Commons would offer "table board" to the residents of Hartley and Livingston Halls and, as a special inducement, "seats at table will be assigned so that they may be retained throughout the year." But on 24 October, the college paper announced that over three hundred men were living in the halls but less than 140 were "boarding at the Commons." Here again the lack of proximity was a factor that was not solved until the opening of the dining hall in John Jay—but this was after the World War and the cafeteria had become the popular kind of eating place.

During all the agitation for residence halls much had been said about student government. As early as 9 January, *Spectator* remarked editorially:

President Butler is prepared to place a large share of the control of the dormitories in the hands of the students. We are confident that an efficient house committee will do much to add to the success of student life.

On November 1, *Spectator* announced the members of the first student Hall Committee.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>3</sup> *Columbia Spectator*, 27 March, 6 April, 24 October, 1905.

<sup>4</sup> STUDENT BODY NOW IN CHARGE OF DORMITORY GOVERNMENT.  
All the student members of the Hall Committees have now been elected, each of the floors of both Halls in living chosen its representative. The complete list is as follows:

## HARTLEY HALL

First floor, J. L. Keith 19071.  
Second floor, F. D. Packernall 1906

The first get-together had been a college sing on the steps of Hartley Hall as early as 2 October.<sup>1</sup> But as soon as the committees were organized a regular program was set up. The first smoker was held on 14 December, 1905.<sup>2</sup>

On another occasion the Livingston Committee went through the hall "blowing on tin horns and loudly bidding everyone come to the entertainment."<sup>3</sup> Regardless of on-interest—or lack—in such methods we are impressed with the fact that these two halls were giving social opportunities heretofore lacking and they were appreciated. *Spectator* in an editorial (5 November, 1908) reminded the Hall Committees that nights like these made a man glad "to sit around the fire in Hartley and talk and sing and smoke." But two rather significant movements more adequately expressed the community spirit of the halls. One concerned the repaving of Amsterdam Avenue. *Spectator* reported just before Christmas, 1909:<sup>4</sup>

A movement is on foot to have the cobblestones removed from Amsterdam Avenue on account of the great amount of noise raised by traffic. A petition is in preparation to be sent to the Department of Highways to do away with this evil.

Third floor, A. W. Evans 1906S  
Fourth floor, L. I. Goldsmith 1906L  
Fifth floor, A. W. Meisel 1906L  
Sixth floor, J. W. Broder 1907  
Seventh floor, J. Weil 1906L  
Eighth floor, R. W. Schumway 1907S  
Ninth floor, E. Williams 1907L  
Tenth floor, H. A. Thomas 1906

#### LIVINGSTON HALL

First floor, H. M. Sinclair (Pg)  
Second floor, J. L. Robinson 1906L  
Third floor, M. Cockrell 1907L  
Fourth floor, R. C. Lewis 1907L  
Fifth floor, S. B. Furst 1906S  
Sixth floor, K. N. Simpson 1906S  
Seventh floor, L. S. Ford 1906L  
Eighth floor, L. Weiler (T. C.)  
Ninth floor, W. Campbell (Pg)  
Tenth floor, G. A. Quater 1906L

The election of a chairman of each Hall committee will be effected as soon as possible in order to select the student members of the Hall Council of Five, of which F. A. Goetz, the Superintendent of Buildings and Grounds, is ex-officio, the chairman. The other two members of this Council are to be resident members of the faculty in the respective halls.

<sup>1</sup> *Columbia Spectator*, 30 September, 1905.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 13 December, 1905.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 23 February, 1909.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 14 December, 1909.

Students who reside in Hartley and Livingston Halls, who have to do a great deal of studying in their rooms are mainly responsible for this movement. Two or three business men who have stores on the Avenue between 110th and 120th Streets have written letters to the Hartley Hall Committee on Street improvement, endorsing their action and offering their support. Residents of apartments in the vicinity have promised to sign the petition, while the matter is enthusiastically supported by the St. Luke's hospital authorities.

When the petition is prepared, it will be sent at once to the Department of Highways in order that the work of tearing up the cobblestones and replacing them with asphalt be begun as soon as possible.

The movement was successful (as attested by a Hardye Saengerfest! when L. H. Robinson's 12L unveiled a cobbie) and in no small part due to the general and persistent interest of the dormitory residents. A second characteristic of these early days was the publication of *The Dorms*—"the only paper of its kind published in America."<sup>5</sup> The first issue appeared on 16 December, 1906, and contained this statement of purpose:

*The Dorms* owes its existence to the need of a more effective way for the dormitory men to keep in touch with what is going on under their own roof. The Hall Committees have been so active that it seems expedient to inform the men what their representatives are doing. The efforts to encourage inter-dormitory athletics, and the attempts to organize non-athletic activities, have heretofore been seriously handicapped for lack of a direct way of reaching the students living in the Halls. By means of a weekly publication all these wants may be satisfied. *The Dorms* will print news only of Hartley and Livingston Halls, and will devote its pages exclusively to dormitory interests. It will attempt:

1. To offer the Committees a means of 'presenting regularly a concise account of business activities.'
2. To promote more effectively athletic and non-athletic activities.
3. To discuss problems not of special interest to the University at large, but of vital interest to Hartley and Livingston men.
4. To foster a real dormitory spirit. That such a spirit exists can not be denied, and it is in the purpose of cherishing and encouraging this spirit that *The Dorms* finds its ultimate excuse for being.

From a business point of view, *The Dorms* is a good advertising proposition. With the proper support it is possible that the proceeds will be large enough to support, at least in part, the Dormitory Smokers, Teas and other social functions.

<sup>5</sup> *Columbia Spectator*, 30 September, 1906; October, 1910.

<sup>6</sup> "The Dorm—A Unique Journal," *Columbia Alumni News*, 1 May, 1914; *Columbia Spectator*, 25 December, 1906, 10 October, 1907, 26 September, 1908, 6 October, 1910.

The present staff, elected by the Hall Committees, is by no means complete, and men are urged to come out and try for a place.

The personnel of the new weekly was: Editor, Marshall Robie; Staff, A. L. Clark, E. H. Leaning, V. K. Wellington Koo, L. Himmelfoch, H. N. Moore, W. M. Sage, E. Stagg Whitin. For almost ten years this paper offered to the residents of the halls a clearing house for all kinds of matters. Although much of its material was personal and concerned the questions of the moment it was of much value in consolidating and expressing the community life on South Field prior to the outbreak of the World War. Toward the end of its career *The Dorms* included representatives from Whittier and Brooks Halls on its staff and attempted to represent the resident life of the University rather than just that of the men's halls. The possession of the bound volumes of this publication in Columbia offers interesting material—especially in its thumb nail sketches of residents and its series of descriptions of trips to various parts of the campus and beyond—in refutation of the charge that residence halls in a city college were without color. The President's Greeting at the opening of college in 1911 contained an interesting paragraph:

To secure Residence Halls for Columbia was a long, weary, and often a most discouraging task. Not only were there no funds available for many years, but a strong element of university and public opinion was antagonistic on grounds of expediency to our introducing residence life at Columbia. Most fortunately, as I think, the other point of view prevailed, and by the extremely generous initiative of a young alumnus and that of a member of his immediate family, the Trustees were able to provide Hartley and Livingston Halls for the residents. These great buildings have justified themselves ten times over. They have been one of the most important factors in making our college and university life more attractive, more homelike, and more interesting. They have become the center for the development of college and university loyalty and enthusiasm. In them scores and hundreds of valuable and lasting friendships have already been made. In short, Hartley and Livingston are indispensable to the Columbia of today.

But the Christmas editions of *The Dorms* were their masterpiece. The covers typical of the homecoming of urbanite

<sup>1</sup> *The Dorms*, 16 December, 1906.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 1 October, 1915.

students and stories and verse were most appropriate. Then each one carried an invitation for the Yule Log—a cherished tradition that started in 1910 and survived the war by several years. The report of the first of these occasions is worth giving in entirety:<sup>1</sup>

And so, fellow Columbians, I propose to you this toast: May the fire which you have kindled here tonight consume within you all that is base and low and unworthy of Columbian ideals, may it continue to burn with ever increasing fervor, to illumine the pathway and to light the way for Columbia that will be greater and truer and nobler. These were the words of President Butler as he stood by the Hartley Hall fireplace, and, after the ancient custom of King's College, toasted the future of Columbia.

The scene had been one such as Columbia men will never forget. In the Hartley foyer, the chairs were drawn up in great semi-circles around the fireplace. The lights were low and the darkness and silence was broken only by the soft glow of cigarettes or an occasional whisper. Suddenly the doors burst open, and the Yule Men entered singing an old Christmas carol and dragging after them the great Yule Log. With slow dignity they placed it upon the irons and then President Butler taking the great candle lighted the pile. As the flames leaped up, he stepped to the side of the fireplace and to Columbia men he told of the meaning of Columbian spirit. He spoke of the unity of feeling between the universities of the centuries past and our own and said that we must be great because we adhere to great ideals no did they, those days. In conclusion he proposed the formal toast to Columbia.

A fireside poem, written by C. Schlesinger, was read and then Dean Goetze was called upon. He related several stories of the difficulties that we met with in the construction of the Dormitories and paid a glowing tribute to Marcellus Hartley Dodge, whose generosity had made Hartley Hall possible. When he had finished, E. Stagg Whitin proposed a standing toast to "Marcellus" Dodge, and it was unanimously voted to send to him the Christmas greetings of the dormitories.

Following this, Alumni speeches were called for and A. D. Henry '84, B. B. Lawrence '78, the new Alumni Trustee, A. S. Mapes '88, and F. D. Shaw '74 responded. They dwelt upon the meaning of the Yule-Tide celebration in binding Columbia men together, of the growth of Columbia as a dormitory college and of the characteristics of Columbia dormitory life, which set it off from the life of all other schools in that at Columbia the dormitories were home and retained a home atmosphere.

After the speeches, apples, cider, and popcorn were passed around and an opportunity was given to the younger men to greet the older alumni. The committee in charge, W. J. Timmons, H. M. Kurtzweil, W. W. Dimmick and R. Taylor cannot be too highly congratulated upon the

<sup>1</sup> *The Dorms*, 9 January, 1911.

manner that the entertainment was handled. The decorations were simple yet expressive of the spirit of the occasion, and the songs, the piano solos by C. A. Manning and the vocal solo by G. D. Sutton were not only extremely well given, but were calculated to magnify the harmony of the evening.

The 1912 party was favored by Santa in person.<sup>1</sup>

The ceremonies were formally opened by the bringing in of the Yule log. The group was seated in a great semicircle around the fireside in darkness when the six men in Colonial costume marched in singing the Yule log carol and placed the log upon the irons of the fireplace.

Then the President, following the old English custom, lighted the pile with the great candle and as the flames began to leap upward, he reviewed the history of the Yule Log Celebration. "In Columbia," he said, "its warm glow cast out a bond of good fellowship that bound together thousands of Columbia hearts in common ties of friendship."

The following Dormites participated in the ceremonies in Colonial costumes and sang the Yule Log carol: W. J. Timmons, P. C. W. Ackerman, J. E. Duggan, H. B. Henderson, O. Batchellor, R. S. Harris, E. Stagg Whitin, acted as master of ceremonies, and with his famous introductions brought forward the speakers of the evening.

Among the alumni who responded with short talks and Christmas greetings were Ambrose D. Henry of the Early Eighties, Charles H. Mapes of the Upper Eighties, and Frederick K. Seward, '99.

H. Duncan Bulkley, '02, tendered several vocal and piano selections.

President Butler was telling a story of an old colored Presbyterian and a politician when Santa Claus (alumni trustee Lawrence) wearing the regulation Kris Kringle outfit, staggered in under the weight of a heavy canvas bag and distributed various tin horns and rattlers indiscriminately among the crowd. He handed the president a Teddy Bear and a small drum with sticks. In three minutes a perfect bedlam reigned out of which Santa disappeared.

Before the meeting broke up W. J. Timmons, chairman of the arrangement committee, insisted that every one present take advantage of the opportunity afforded of meeting the president personally. This suggestion was carried out by the men and the festival ended in a spirit of comradeship.

The Dormites owe hearty thanks to the committee in charge which consisted of J. E. Duggan, J. A. Murphy, P. Chazal, C. Lanier and W. J. Timmons, chairman.

The social program was a success and *The Dorms* publicity had done much to further that end. There was a continuous series of smokers, recitals (Professor Mason and the Music

<sup>1</sup> *The Dorms*, 5 January, 1912.

Department are frequently mentioned), athletic contests between the halls, and various kinds of get-togethers. One year the invitation to the Dean's Reception was carried to the students in an almost full page notice that made that party the center of interest to all readers. Professor Erskine voiced his appreciation in a very characteristic message to the editor of *The Dorms*.<sup>2</sup>

The Dormitories are still so new that graduates of a decade ago remember what it was to be a sort of college day scholar. Hartley and Livingston were, if not castles in Spain, at least very faint hopes and prospects. Now that a second generation of dormitories is at hand, and we shall soon be speaking of the present ones as among the "old buildings," the alumnus is made pleasantly aware that our living bulks have already some memories and traditions of their own, and a community life that needs for its expression a dormitory paper—dormitory, but not nonsolent.

I suppose that in detail the dormitory life is not what we 19th century students hope it would be. Yet how fortunate that it is not! Our ideal was based on observation of similar buildings in other colleges—and it is far better than Columbin should in all things discover a way of her own. You men in the dormitories have certain obvious responsibilities to the college but I like to think that very few of you fancy the eyes of the world are watching whether you take traditional "college life" postures. The world is otherwise occupied, and meanwhile you are fashioning the soul of your house after your own best inspirations. Traditions are fine things—I congratulate you on your privilege of making them.

*And Spectator's* editorial at the beginning of 1913 bears additional evidence to the kind of life the two halls had been able to develop in the first eight years of their existence.<sup>3</sup>

The Dormitories have played a so increasingly important rôle in preserving and producing Columbin spirit. The original idea of Mr. Dodge in giving Hartley Hall was to create a rendezvous for Columbia students, to take the place, after a fashion of the long longed-for Columbia Student Club House. That it has more than fulfilled its donor's purpose is due to the very laudable way in which Dormites have taken up matters relating to student interests. The Yuletide ceremony for those who do not get home for Christmas, has been a tremendous success for three seasons. But the latest addition to Dorms activities, the dance offers, we think a great many useful potentialities.

There is no general University social gathering, with the exception of the teas, where men can mingle, irrespective of organization affiliations. The

<sup>2</sup> *The Dorms*, 17 October, 1912.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 13 November, 1913.

<sup>4</sup> *Columbia Spectator*, 13 January, 1913.

Dorms are somewhat local, but they have this advantage, that they permit social intercourse on a plane, unaffected by other allegiances. It is a common ground where University spirit and genuine good fellowship may unite men, whose interests lead them far from each other. It concentrates and focuses enthusiasm. We congratulate the Dormites for their enterprise, their loyalty and their success. We hope that their dances will become the nucleus for University social functions.

In the spring of 1909, South Field was graded—and the athletic field laid out with a gridiron, 440-yard circular track, 120-yard straightaway and tennis courts. This made it possible for Columbia to meet visiting teams without having to go all over the city for an available playing ground. It also gave the residence halls a far more attractive setting. *Spectator* reminded us that this was a fine opportunity to develop knowledge of "that engine of attack known as a steam shovel." This change not only removed several cottages but also some of our noblest trees. But as the Dorms reported, "We at last have a man's size field which will compare favorably with those of other universities." A picture of Marcellus Hartley (another gift of the donors) was placed in the entrance lobby of the Hall named in his memory. Several years later when the lobbies of Hartley and Livingston Halls had been refurbished by Mr. Dodge, a reception was held to celebrate the gift. Morris W. Watkins '24, chairman of the hall committee, presided and President Butler told in detail of the Civil War services of Marcellus Hartley. At the opening of college in 1909, a window was unveiled to the memory of Robert R. Livingston of the Class of 1765, one time Chancellor of the State of New York. This was the gift of John Henry Livingston '69, Edward dePeyster Livingston '82, and Goodhue Livingston '88. A good fiction library was opened in Hartley Hall in 1913 to assist in making the hall homelike; this was given in memory of Edward W. Scudder Johnston '86. In the President's Greetings to the newly enrolled men in the fall of 1912 he had said, "Furnald

Hall will be ready in about a year." This was a memorial to Royal Blackler Furnald of the Class of 1901. The corner stone was laid 2 December, 1912 and it was opened to students for the fall term of 1913. In November a very interesting meeting was held in the foyer of the newest hall which *Spectator* described at some length:

One of the most impressive and representative gatherings on the campus this year came together in Furnald Hall yesterday. It was on the occasion of the reception tea to Mrs. Francis P. Furnald, widow of the donor of the Hall, and the presentation of a beautiful silver cup to her by President Butler in the name of the residents of Furnald Hall.

At half past four, the program of the afternoon was begun. Professor George C. D. Odell spoke, in his own delightful way, on "Royal Blackler Furnald" in whose memory the Hall was built.

Professor Odell told how Royal Furnald had entered college in 1899, a typical campus man, who would be at home in any part of this world, a man of true college instincts with a deep interest in literature. "He had been in my classes," said Professor Odell, "during all his time at college and was a youth of literary attainment. His writings have been collected in this volume." In closing Professor Odell read two very charming lyrical poems from the little volume, showing the embryonic pen of Royal Furnald.

Dean Goetze followed with a short talk on "Furnald Hall" explaining its improvements over the older residence halls, Hartley and Livingston, and referring to the kindness and thoughtful generosity which made it possible.

C. F. Milheiser '15, Chairman of the Hall, then introduced President Butler. At the same time, two members of the committee advanced with the loving cup, a beautiful example of the silversmith's art, which bore the simple inscription "To Mrs. Furnald from the Residents of Furnald Hall, November 13th, 1913." It was received by Dr. Butler who addressed the assemblage. He said "Mrs. Furnald, you are already bound by many ties; bound by the ties of your son's affection, bound by the memory of your husband's provision for this memorial, bound by your own thoughtful generosity. You are now to be bound by another tie of greatest value, of greatest strength and tenderness. It is the tie of grateful appreciation of the young men who are in Furnald Hall. They wish to offer in this token of their own design and words an expression of how they feel as dwellers in Furnald Hall. It is no small pleasure for me to place in your hands this symbol of their affectionate regard. The buildings of our University bear many names; some are named for great scholars and statesmen, some for the purpose they serve, and still others for the donors themselves, but now for the first time we are gathered in

<sup>1</sup> *Columbia Spectator*, 23, 27 March, 1909; *The Dorms*, 4 April, 1909.

<sup>2</sup> *The Dorms*, 24 November, 1907.

<sup>3</sup> *Columbia Spectator*, 5 April, 1923.

<sup>4</sup> *COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY QUARTERLY*, December, 1909, XII, 371 *Columbia Alumni News*, 25 October, 1909.

<sup>5</sup> *Columbia Spectator*, 8 April, 18 December, 1913; *Columbia Alumni News*, 23 May, 1913.

<sup>6</sup> *The Dorms*, 6 October, 1912.

<sup>7</sup> *COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY QUARTERLY*, March, 1913, XV, 1751 *Columbia Spectator*, 27 September, 1913; *Columbia Alumni News*, 13 December, 1913.

a building named for a student of Columbia. It is a building, where lasting friendships, traditions and memories will always linger when old Columbia men come back. It is eminently fitting that it should be so. The residents of Fernald Hall have signified to you from their hearts and their minds their true appreciation and I, as their representative take pleasure in representing to you this symbolic token of deep regard and the feeling which lies behind it.<sup>12</sup>

This third hall was a welcome addition to residence facilities. The two Amsterdam Avenue halls had slowly but steadily increased their numbers and by 1910<sup>13</sup> were maintaining waiting lists. Fernald Hall's opening enables 900 to live on South Field and this total would have been quickly maintained had not the war interfered. During 1915-16<sup>14</sup> a height of over 850 was reached but it was no sooner attained than the downward trend began. War demands were reducing university enrollment. In the fall of 1917 Fernald Hall not being needed by men students was transferred to university women for five years. It was not until September 1922<sup>15</sup> that Fernald again joined with the two older halls for the housing of men. During this interval the S.A.T.C. had taken over Hartley and Livingston Halls. From 31 August to 21 December, 1918 the men students were paid, housed, fed, and taught by the university under contract with the United States Government.

At a dormitory smoke! Dean Goetze<sup>16</sup> had once told something of the history of the dormitories and paid high tribute to the hall committees:

As soon as the need of accommodations for out-of-town students was plainly felt, plans for dormitories were constantly brought up at the meetings of the Board of Trustees.

One of the schemes was to have a series of residence halls extending all the way around South Field with the field as an open court in the centre. This fell through because of lack of funds. Numerous other plans were brought up but none came to a definite conclusion. Then in 1904 and 1905 through the gifts of Mrs. Helen Hartley Jenkins and Marcellus Hartley Dodge and the use of some university funds, Hartley and Livingston Halls were built.

<sup>12</sup> *Columbia Spectator*, 24 November, 1913; *Columbia Alumni News*, 27 November, 1913.

<sup>13</sup> *Columbia Spectator*, 15 November, 1909, 9 October, 1910.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, 31 October, 1910.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, 24 October, 1917.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, 9 May, 1922.

<sup>17</sup> *The Dorms*, 13 January, 1913; *Columbia Alumni News*, 10 January, 1913.

When the Halls were first planned it was thought that the buildings should be three-story affairs, but after considering the fact that property was so expensive here it was decided to go up in the air, with the result that ten story buildings were constructed.

I do not believe that there are any other residence halls at universities and colleges throughout the country in which the students take so much interest as at Columbia. Of course, there is a fierce rough-housing now and then, but on the whole every undergraduate has a certain pride in living here. The work of the hall committees has contributed largely to bringing about a truly democratic spirit. At other colleges the halls govern the students, but at Columbia the students govern the halls.

This is of special interest because it contradicts the fear (expressed by *Spectator*, 28 September, 1904, before Hartley Hall was ready) that in large cities the high price of land makes it very difficult to have a revenue producing dormitory in which the charges to students will be low enough to encourage, rather than interfere with, a spirit of democracy. In 1921 when agitation for the new student building was under way *Spectator*<sup>17</sup> restated the problem in clear terms.

Confronted with the stern problem of high realties Columbia faces many difficulties in building new structures. In the first place college edifices can not ramble over a wide territory; and since the territory is necessarily limited the buildings must be erected with an eye primarily to high capacity on small acreage. Thus the construction of a dormitory becomes in practice the construction of a two story apartment house.

But in the beginning the community life of the two halls functioned efficiently through student representatives<sup>18</sup> as E. P. Kilroe, chairman of the 1910-11 Hartley Hall Committee explains in a very careful outline of the plan entitled, "The Hall Committee."<sup>19</sup> But the problem of the congenial grouping of residents dated from the opening of the residence halls and became intensified as the numbers on South Field increased. Not only were small units impossible (high buildings with elevators and long hallways tended toward standardization) but the rates for rooms varied according to floor with the more expensive locations in the upper part of each building. This constantly tended to break up groups according to ability to pay and not on the bases of academic or of social preference. This was a factor in discipline but it was

<sup>18</sup> *Columbia Spectator*, 24 May, 1921.

<sup>19</sup> *The Dorms*, 18 December, 1910.



even more important in attempting to foster undergraduate residence. As early as the spring of 1908 a senior<sup>1</sup> had written to the editor of *Spectator* that although Hartley was given to be the home of college men; he noted that out of 211 residents only 39 were undergraduates. His solution was "Reduce the rates and let college men in." As soon as Farnald was under construction, *Spectator*<sup>2</sup> urged that two of the three halls be reserved for undergraduates—freshmen and juniors in one, the other with sophomores and seniors. Despite the war interference the plan was restated in 1919 when Student Board proposed a rather drastic residence rule. In the form of a petition it was submitted to students, faculty and trustees.<sup>3</sup>

The undersigned students of Columbia College hereby recommend for approval by the President, Trustees, and Faculty of Columbia University a Students' Residence Rule which will embrace the following conditions:

1. Every student who is a candidate for a degree in Columbia College must reside in a dormitory or a fraternity house for two years prior to receiving his degree.
2. The Freshman and Sophomore years are required as the period of residence unless the Faculty Board for sufficient reason allows the student to choose two other years for residence.
3. Students matriculating this year, or having previously matriculated, will not be subject to this ruling, but are emphatically urged to promote and comply with it.
4. The College shall make adequate provision, by means of scholarships or special exceptions to the Residence Rule, for a limited number of students who would be financially unable to attend college otherwise.
5. The exceptions to this rule are to be authorized by a Faculty Board upon the presentation of satisfactory evidence that the student can not financially afford to meet the obligations.

This plan received the endorsement of all parties at interest. *Spectator* was very strong in its praise and devoted much space to furthering the cause—these two paragraphs are typical:

A homogeneous group of men, residing in the college and having interested participation in all activities is, in substance, the object which the student body hoped to accomplish when it voted so overwhelmingly

<sup>1</sup> *Columbia Spectator*, 28 April, 1908.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 17 March, 1913.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 9 October, 1919.

ingly for the Residence Rule. Altho no other city college had attempted a similar plan, it was thought that Columbia's position in the heart of America's largest city made her situation exceptional enough to justify such an experiment.<sup>1</sup>

"Jester can see no further than a complete Residence Rule for all Freshmen. Without this, Columbia must necessarily continue to be New York's biggest day school." It seems to us that in these two short sentences, expressed as only a wit could express them, are embodied the solution of the oft-repeated question: "What's wrong with Columbia?" Not that we think there is any radical flaw in our collegiate makeup, but simply that there is room for improvement, a great deal of room, and it would seem cowardly to us, if every effort were not made toward the attainment of our ideal which is exemplified in our pictures of the "New Columbia."<sup>2</sup>

In accord with this project we find the President's report for 1919 suggesting a building on South Field with adequate dining halls and facilities for all undergraduate activities and also for two additional residence halls on 114th Street, one on the corner of Amsterdam Avenue and the other at Broadway. The next year the *Alumni News* carried an illustrated article by Dr. Edward S. Elliott,<sup>3</sup> chairman of the Residence Halls Committee, supporting the residence rule but adding "We need more adequate accommodations before the scheme will function normally." The matter was summed up by Dean Hawkes' memorandum published by *Spectator*, 20 May, 1923:

Altho *Spectator* would by far prefer to see a stringent residence rule in operation, the circumstances compel a resort to a less efficient alternative—an appeal to the students themselves to make their homes in the dormitories. The following memorandum, which has been prepared by Dean Hawkes, depicts in brief the advantages of dormitory life, and will give to students who are considering the residence problem subjectively "something which they can take to their parents as a point of departure for the discussion of the question."

During recent years the Trustees and Faculty have devoted a great deal of thought, effort and money to the problem of enriching the dormitory life at the University. The recent gift of Mr. Dodge in beautifying Hartley Hall is an evidence of the way in which the authorities feel in regard to the matter.

Almost without exception the students who live in the dormitories recognize the advantages of living at College. Not only is the time wasted

<sup>1</sup> *Columbia Spectator*, 30 November, 1919.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 3 February, 1921.

<sup>3</sup> *Columbia Alumni News*, 22 April, 1921.

in commuting saved for study and for making the personal contacts and relationships which after all form a very important part of the College experience, but the combination of independence and restraint which dormitory life encourages is a part of the education which the College is anxious to afford.

I would urge all students of Columbia College who are not now in residence to discuss the matter very seriously with their parents in order that the question may be decided after full and careful consideration. There is no doubt that, other things being equal, it is very desirable for the College men to live at the College.

And here the matter was permitted to stand. Within a short time additional facilities were provided but on a scale that did not permit of the continuance of the former solidarity. A new plan<sup>1</sup> was tried and adopted. And undergraduates (from their first application to the Admissions Office) are told of the dormitories and urged to become residents on the campus. Dean Hawkes once wrote:

The most important single social influence in a man's college career is his dormitory life. Those who do not recognize the opportunity of the University for effective social education through the careful and unobstructive organization and refinement of our dormitory life, fail to understand what manner of institution Columbia College really is.<sup>2</sup>

No rule was attempted but the undergraduate group has averaged four hundred out of a total of 1350 residents.<sup>3</sup>

When the new Students' Hall was authorized *Spectator* carried an editorial, 6 October, 1925, entitled "Pioneer days are over." And this was true in many ways. A couple of years before the president had reorganized the Men's Residence Halls Committee designating the Dean of Columbia College as chairman and making the Earl Hall office as the place of assignment for the South Field dormitories.<sup>4</sup> 4 February, 1925 the Trustees announced the building of a new hall for student activities and residences.<sup>5</sup> The corner stone was laid on 5 October, with addresses by Mr. Albert W.

<sup>1</sup> *Columbia Spectator*, 14 January, 1931.

<sup>2</sup> *Annual Report*, 1921, 36.

<sup>3</sup> Data from the Minutes of the Men's Residence Halls Committee, 1928-1929 [in manuscript].

<sup>4</sup> President's memorandum regarding University Residence Halls, 1 December, 1925 [in manuscript].

<sup>5</sup> *Columbia Spectator*, 4 February, 1925.

Putnam of the trustees and President Butler.<sup>1</sup> The President said:

With the erection of this building to house all student activities we come to the beginning of the end of the plans which were made for this University 170 years ago when Sir Charles Hardy, Lieutenant Governor of the Province of New York, laid the cornerstone of the first building of Columbia College.

When the plans for the present university were made forty years ago, there were some who advocated the establishment of an institution for graduate and professional study only. Others were in favor of a University in the city with the College established in the suburbs. The majority, however, favored the foundation of a university with Columbia College as the heart of the institution. We are glad that the last plan was adopted for Columbia College, more powerful and more effective than it has ever been, is a visible entity in the present university and an actively functioning part of it. This Students Hall will provide a common meeting place where the pleasant experiences of college life will be conducted.

Subsequently the building was named for John Jay of the Class of 1764, first Chief Justice of the United States.<sup>2</sup> In the College Quadrangle three of the greatest names on Columbia's rolls were perpetuated—Hamilton, Livingston, and Jay. *Spectator* was quick to point out that in the original building down town John Jay had once defied President Myles Cooper.<sup>3</sup> But these changes meant that East Hall<sup>4</sup> long the center of activities, would be abandoned by the College. "We will lose a part of the intimacy created by the crowded conditions of the little red brick building!" Certainly it was a contrast to move to a fifteen-story building—the highest on the campus—as the activities did during the Christmas holidays of 1926. The entire fourth floor had been arranged to meet their needs with offices for the athletic interests and adequate accommodations for the literary, dramatic and musical interests included under King's Crown. Two months earlier the dormitory rooms had been put into use. The first residents had moved in during October. The dining hall and grill were opened in February, 1927. But Henry M. Robinson's poem<sup>5</sup> more adequately expressed

<sup>1</sup> *Columbia Spectator*, 6 October, 1925.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 4 January, 1926.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 5 January, 1926.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 17 December, 1925.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, 2 February, 1927.

the feeling of the student body toward the new John Jay Hall.

#### FULFILLMENT

Oh, Morningside has need of one retreat  
With firm, substantial chairs and solid food  
Where undergraduates may enervate their meat  
And talk all night if talking be their mood.  
Where round a college table, college men  
May hatch their schemes and right their college wrongs,  
And having buried one, revive again  
Old arguments, old loves and older songs.

Where men break bread or share the common salt  
Of fellowships, there understanding dwells,  
And brothers can condone a brother's fault  
If food and warmth have eased their subtle spells  
About the hall where high fraternity  
Comingles with the drink, and season's meat.

Now with four halls accommodating over 1350 men, conditions have changed perceptibly from the pre-war days when *The Dorms* was published. Not only are there many more residents but they have more complex interests and are increasingly individualistic in their ways. Many of the graduate and professional school students have come to New York from other colleges in order to devote themselves to special training and, in addition, many are obliged to devote much of their time to remunerative work. The undergraduate residents are divided into two groups—those in Hartley Hall and those on the lower three floors of John Jay. A successful attempt has been made to meet these new conditions by the appointment of faculty counsellors. This was well described by *Spectator*, 14 January, 1931:

Two years ago a group of students and a member of the Faculty banded together and rented a suite on the seventh floor of John Jay. Comfortable furnishings, a radio and magazines were put into the two rooms. Breakfast was served there, card games were played and early-morning discussions were held. Students who found the College and the metropolis strange and forbidding were made to feel at home. The group organized its own basketball squad and played other teams in the Gymnasium. In the congenial atmosphere of the suite, ideas were developed and acquaintanceships were expanded. The rooms were, and are a catalytic agent in the formation of friendships.

The Board of Trustees of the University is soon to take up the proposition of setting aside similar rooms on the fifth and sixth floors of John

Jay to be used as social havens for the men on each floor. As closely as possible the functions of the suites will be patterned on those of 740-741 John Jay at the present time. Only College undergraduates will be expected to participate in the groups, as the older men in the University have shown disinterest in such activities. The principal difference between the existing plan and the proposed one is that the suites will be provided gratis by the University, instead of being paid for by the students.

If the authorities pass upon this project, a much needed step will have been taken to further the social deficiencies of the dormitories. The buildings are too large, and the lounge rooms too distant from the individual room to provide any adequate facilities for the promulgation of Campus camaraderie. Especially those men who come to the City without any contacts are in need of supervision on the part of the University authorities to secure them from social isolation. It is hoped that, if the present plan meets with approval, it will be only the first of a series of programs designed to make more pleasant the Campus residents' hours of recreation.

This plan, based on the floor unit, is proving successful and has taken the place of community grouping such as prevailed before the war. In addition the help of a faculty hostess has made possible parties for any group of residents that care to entertain in the halls. The dining facilities and social rooms make possible varied programs.

The contrast between the original college building containing "four staircases with twelve apartments each" facing the river and the present halls on South Quadrangle is about as sharp as is possible to imagine. The normal number of residents each of the three terms is over 1300 and the annual income to the University is in excess of \$360,000. As this is being written the noise of construction of the new library sounds like a warning that the playing field around which the present halls are grouped is due for radical change. The problem of adjustment to city conditions is constant and it is no easy task to maintain the welfare of residents under these pressures. Apparently Columbia can have no "house plan" to assist her in her residence problem for the bases of her task were established by the discussions that led to the type of building used in 1904. But, ten years ago, the ideal in administration was stated by President Butler:

It is to be borne in mind that the provision of residence halls is quite as important and as essential a part of the work of the University as is the provision of libraries, laboratories, and class rooms. The chief purpose of university residence halls is not one of mere housing, but rather one of education and educational influence. The cost of residence halls, whether met from the general funds of the University or from gift or bequest, is to be regarded as an expenditure for necessary educational equipment and not primarily as an investment. If the residence halls can be so managed, without impairing their educational usefulness, as to produce a fair return on the sum invested in them, so much the better; but that consideration must always be a secondary one.